

Judge Drain:

There are many good reasons to question the soundness of this plan, but I would like to focus on just one, the responsibility of the court to Delphi's creditors.

I believe it is incumbent upon you to ask the following:

1. Why would Platinum Equity's offer for Delphi be accepted when it is lower than the book value of only fixed assets?
2. Why would the offer be accepted when it is less than Platinum will pay for Alcoa AFL, a much smaller entity?
3. Why would Delphi be requesting the PBGC drop its right to secured claims and foisting undue burden to taxpayers?
4. What were the specific terms and conditions of all offers and how do they compare with the one in the proposed "emergence/liquidation" plan?

Mr. Drain, I truly believe that it is irresponsible to accept this plan. It ill serves not only the retirees, who will be cheated out of what they spent their lives working for, but also the creditors, as mentioned above, and the taxpayers who will wind up funding the PBCG.

While I realize that fairness to all parties may not be not the court's priority,
IT MUST BE THE COURT'S PRIORITY TO PROTECT THE CREDITORS. SIMPLY PUT,
THAT IS THE COURT'S JOB.

As a happy coincidence, doing the responsible thing will also mean doing the right thing for all parties, not just the selected few who manipulated this proposal to their advantage.

PLEASE MAKE SURE THIS HAPPENS. REJECT THIS PLAN.

Sincerely,
Herbert S. Daugherty
El Paso, TX
915 587 6586